

**PHILLIPS COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS**

**Submitted by Deborah King, Ed.D.**

**Vice Chancellor for Instruction**

**(870) 338-6474 ext. 1241**

**[dking@pccua.edu](mailto:dking@pccua.edu)**

**Institutional Report on the Annual Review of Faculty Performance**

**Academic Year: 2013-2014**

---

Arkansas statute (ACA 6-63-104) and AHECB policy require that each college and university conduct an annual review of each faculty member's performance. ADHE is required to monitor the evaluation process and report findings to the Coordinating Board and Legislative Council. This form will collect the information required for reporting purposes.

**Directions:** Summarize the Annual Faculty Performance Review process at your institution. **When a description is requested, please provide only a summary on the report form—brief, concise, and to the point.** Should you need to elaborate further on any of these points, attach additional information as an appendix to this form. An electronic copy of this report is due to ADHE by June 1, 2014

**Elements of the Faculty Performance Review Process**

**1. Summarize the overall faculty performance review process.**

Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas (PCCUA) has completed the faculty performance review using an evaluation tool (questionnaire, portfolio, course evidence) which measures instructional delivery, instructional design, and course management.

The instructional delivery is measured using a student questionnaire administered to two classes, selected by the dean of the division, each fall and spring semester. If either class selected has fewer than ten students enrolled, an additional class is selected until at least twenty students are asked to complete the student questionnaire.

The instructional design is evaluated using a portfolio. The teaching portfolio is an open-ended collection of artifacts, selected by the instructor which document his or her teaching performance. At a minimum the teaching portfolio includes syllabi for courses taught during the year and a description of college service, community service, and professional development activities. The teaching portfolio is reviewed by the division dean and a peer review committee. The peer review committee is composed of one faculty member selected by the instructor from the instructor's division, one faculty member selected by the division dean from the division, and one faculty member from another division selected by the Faculty Development Committee.

The course management segment of the evaluation is evaluated by the division dean and addresses issues related to management in instruction (interaction, submission of grades, reports, student documentation, and other reporting functions, classroom management).

Faculty members have recourse for peer evaluation outcomes which the instructor believes to be inaccurate or unfair. The evaluation appeal goes to a Faculty Evaluation Appeal Committee who reviews the issue and makes recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Instruction. The Vice Chancellor reviews the appeal and makes the final decision whether to accept or reject the appeal.

## **2. How are faculty peers involved in faculty performance?**

PCCUA uses a peer evaluation process as part of the faculty performance review process. The instructional portfolio is reviewed by the division dean and a peer review committee. The peer review committee is composed of one faculty member selected by the instructor from the instructor's division, one faculty member selected by the division dean from the division, and one faculty member from another division selected by the Faculty Development Committee.

## **3. How are students involved in faculty performance?**

Each fall and spring semester, a student questionnaire is administered to two classes. These classes must have an enrollment of at least ten students or a combined enrollment of twenty students. If the two classes are exceptionally small, an additional class is selected until at least twenty students are asked to complete the student questionnaire. These surveys are administered during the seventh or eighth week of each semester on a class day selected by the instructor. Responses for the questionnaires are kept anonymous (no names are placed on the forms) and students have an opportunity to evaluate specific aspects of instruction as well as to write comments concerning instruction.

## **4. How are administrators involved in faculty performance?**

Deans are responsible for the course management portion of the evaluation. In addition the dean is responsible for reviewing the evaluation outcomes with each faculty member and they sign the evaluation in the presence of the instructor. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the Vice Chancellor for Instruction reviews all faculty evaluations.

## **5. How do faculty members self-evaluate their performance?**

The actual teaching portfolio contains specific artifacts related to instruction (syllabi, syllabi and course changes, projects, samples of grading, etc.). Each faculty member is asked to provide input into the results of the evaluation and there is an opportunity to write comments about the process, outcome, or supervision. In many ways, the portfolio process is self-evaluation because the faculty member selects what items to include. Certainly, some faculty are more conscientious than others about gathering information for the portfolio.

## **6. Describe any other activities used to evaluate faculty performance.**

College service, professional development, and community service are part of what is included in evaluating a faculty member's performance. Instructors must provide evidence that five or more activities, workshops, or contributions have been made in these three service areas. All service areas must have at least one contribution made by the faculty member. Faculty are aware of the process and understand the College has an expectation for them to be engaged in each area of development or service.

### **Institutional Monitoring of the Faculty Performance Review Process**

1. Does the institution monitor the annual faculty review process?  Yes  No

2. If yes, describe the procedures and persons responsible for the monitoring.

The Vice Chancellor for Instruction is responsible for monitoring the process. The administration of the faculty designed evaluation is completed through the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. In addition, the Vice Chancellor for Instruction reviews the evaluation outcomes for each faculty member and a copy of the evaluation is placed in the personnel file.

3. If no, describe measures that are being taken to begin annual monitoring.

### **Use of Review Findings**

1. How are performance results used in decisions related to promotions, salary increases or job tenure?

PCCUA does not have tenure. Faculty evaluations are used to improve performance. The College does not award merit based pay increases or advancement based solely on performance outcomes. PCCUA has a history of advancing faculty into administrative positions when we are able to do so, thus, making the performance evaluation an important document in the interview for advancement process.

### **English Fluency of Teaching Faculty**

1. How do students and administrators review the English fluency of all teaching faculty—full-time, part-time, and graduate teaching assistants?

English fluency is evaluated as part of the written components of the portfolio.

2. What measures are in place to assist deficient faculty in becoming English proficient?

If through the evaluation process, there was an identified problem with English proficiency, a remediation plan would be developed for the faculty member. That has not been an issue at PCCUA.

3. Summarize English deficiency findings and note action taken by the institution.

None have been noted and there are no non-English speakers teaching at PCCUA.

### **College of Education Support for Accredited Public Schools**

1. If applicable, how does the institution's College of Education and related discipline faculty members work collaboratively with accredited public schools in Arkansas?

PCCUA has no College of Education. N/A

### **Notable Findings and Future Plans**

1. List any notable findings from the annual faculty review process conducted during the year that may have implications for future annual faculty reviews.

The Faculty Performance Evaluation's primary use is for faculty improvement. It is used to gauge faculty instructional delivery and design. It was developed to be used individually with each faculty member. Used in this way, the performance evaluation has been an effective development tool. However, it has been useful to examine departmental faculty performance outcome trends to identify if efforts toward improving performance outcomes of faculty within departments is observable.

The student evaluations of 62 full time faculty resulted in an overall average of 2.80 for Instructional Delivery and 2.88 for Instructional Design (See Table 1). The student evaluations of an additional twenty-six (26) part-time faculty resulted in a 2.73 for Instructional Delivery and a 2.81 in Instructional Design. PCCUA does not require first year or retiring faculty to complete the evaluation process.

**Table 1: Instructional Delivery and Instructional Design**

Division	Instructional Delivery			Instructional Design		
	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
<b>3 Year Trend</b>						
<b>Overall Performance</b>	2.81	2.71	2.80	2.89	2.81	2.88
<b>Divisions</b>						
<b>Adult Ed</b>	2.95	2.80	2.82	2.95	2.82	2.87
<b>Allied Health</b>	2.96	2.81	2.75	2.96	2.88	2.83
<b>Applied Tech.</b>	2.82	2.82	2.85	2.82	2.91	2.91
<b>Arts and Sciences</b>	2.78	2.78	2.77	2.78	2.85	2.87
<b>Business &amp; Information Systems</b>	2.91	2.72	2.88	2.91	2.80	2.92
<b>Career &amp; Tech.</b>	2.51	2.71	2.76	2.51	2.76	2.85

**Table 2: Faculty Portfolio Evaluation Averages (62 full-time faculty were required to complete a portfolio)**

3 Year Trend	2011	2012	2013	2011-13
<b>Overall Portfolio Average</b>	2.82	2.83	2.90	2.85
<b>Division Averages</b>				
<b>Adult Ed</b>	2.95	2.97	2.92	2.94
<b>Allied Health</b>	2.96	2.96	2.95	2.96
<b>Applied Technology</b>	2.82	2.87	2.92	2.87
<b>Arts and Sciences</b>	2.78	2.91	2.81	2.83
<b>Business and Information Systems</b>	2.91	2.93	2.97	2.93
<b>Career and tech Ctr.</b>	2.51	2.45	2.83	2.6

2. Describe any plans or revisions to the annual faculty review process that have been developed as a result of the findings noted above. (Any significant revision to an institution's annual faculty review plan must be submitted to ADHE separate from this report and received by June 1, 2014 in order to be considered for approval by the AHECB at the July 2014 board meeting.)

There have been no changes made to the faculty evaluation. On-line faculty use a team approach to the evaluation of the service portion of the portfolio.

**Level of Faculty Satisfaction with Current Process**

1. On the scale below, indicate the faculty's overall sense of satisfaction with the annual review process. If the rating is low (1 or 2), briefly describe corrective measures that will be implemented.

1---2---3---4---5---6---7---8---9---10  
low high

On a scale of 1-10, the faculty give the Faculty Performance Evaluation a rate of 7. The evaluation process was developed by faculty with administrative input. Many are tired of using the portfolio process because it is quite burdensome. The use of on-line portfolios is being encouraged by the College because it is so much easier to review the information.